

CD
CD
obtained by the focusing of the electromagnetic radiation.

a³
9. (Amended) Component according to claim 1, further comprising a converging lens and a reflector of a headlamp, the reflector of which having an elliptical section.

REMARKS

The above Amendments and following remarks are responsive to all the points of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action dated March 3, 2003. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 9 will have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

The attachment to this Amendment shows the amendments made to claims 1, 3 and 9 by bracketing the text that has been deleted and underlining the text that has been added.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In the Office Action, claim 8, 9, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-14 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duflos (U.S. Patent No. 6,464,382). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duflos. Claims 5, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duflos in view of Guyomard (U.S. Patent No. 6,290,287). Finally, claims 7, 11, 17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM OBJECTION

The Examiner states that claims 7, 11, 17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants choose not to rewrite the above claims as suggested by the Examiner because the amendments herein are believed to be sufficient to overcome the rejections to claim 1, from which claims 7, 11, 17 and 19 depend.

RESPONSE TO §112 REJECTION

The Examiner states that claim 7 is rejected because it is not clear what Applicant intends by "component comprising an insert disposed in the motor vehicle headlamp." Accordingly, Applicants has herein amended Figure 5 by extending a lead line for element 10 to extend within the insert 15 to more clearly distinguish between element 15 and element 10. Fig. 4 has also been amended in the similar manner to more clearly distinguish between element 30 and element 10. A Letter With Proposed Drawing Correction and Fig. 5 and Fig. 4 showing the proposed drawing corrections accompany this paper.

RESPONSE TO §102 REJECTION:

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12-14 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duflos (U.S. Patent No. 6,464,382). Applicants respectively traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

The present invention as recited in amended claim 1 is directed to a component for a motor-vehicle lighting or signaling in which the inclusions are created by electromagnetic

radiation on the material. This is a feature not taught or suggested by Duflos.

Duflos is directed to a lighting apparatus for a motor vehicle, which comprises a light source cooperating with optical diffusing means. The optical means is characterized by use of a diffusing means made of a transparent first material having a first refractive index, and in which inclusions are embedded. The inclusions are part of a second material having a different refractive index from the first material. (see Abstract).

In Duflos, the inclusions are identified as spherical balls that are incorporated into a methacrylate base material, either during manufacture in order to form the optic by moulding, or immediately upstream of the moulding equipment in the production line (see col. 3, lines 23-29). This means that the inclusions are dispersed randomly in the same base material. Nowhere does Duflos identify that the inclusions are created using electromagnetic radiation on the material, as in the present invention.

Conversely, in the present invention, the inclusions 12 are obtained by use of electromagnetic radiation emitter 14, for example a laser, which emits a focused beam, by virtue of optical components 16 and 18, on a transparent material of component 10. In this way, the energy contained in the beam emitted by the emitter 14 is concentrated into an individual volume of the transparent material of component 10. Depending on the energy concentrated into this individual volume, irreversible modifications of the atomic, molecular and/or crystalline structure occur in the individual volume of transparent material. (see page 7, lines 11-35).

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable over Duflos. Likewise, claims 2-20 are also believed to be distinguishable over Duflos based on their dependency on claim 1.

RESPONSE TO § 103 REJECTIONS

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duflos. Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, as set forth above, claim 4 recites features that are neither taught nor suggested by Duflos.

Claims 5, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duflos in view of Guyomard (U.S. Patent No. 6,290,287).

Applicants respectfully submit that Guyomard does not overcome the deficiencies noted above in Duflos to render obvious claim 1. Specifically, Guyomard does not teach or suggest use of inclusions created by an electromagnetic radiation beam. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 15, and 16 are believed to be distinguishable over Duflos in view of Guyomard based upon their dependency on claim 1.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and are now in condition for allowance.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : PINSON, et al. Group Art Unit: 2875
Serial No : 10/033,082 Examiner: Mark TSIDULKO
Filed : December 27, 2001
For : Optical Or Styling Component For A Lighting Or Indicator Device For
A Motor Vehicle

ATTACHMENT SHOWING MARKUP OF CHANGES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Amendments made to specification and claims 1, 3 and 9 herein are indicated in this attachment by bracketing the text that has been deleted and underlining the text that has been added.

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please note the following changes to claims 1, 3 and 9 :

1. (Amended) Component for a motor-vehicle lighting or signaling device, comprising a transparent material within which light-diffusion foci, [consisting of] including local discontinuities [in] created using electromagnetic radiation on said material, [are] and situated only at predetermined locations in order to diffuse the light emitted by a light source associated with the lighting or indicator device.

3. (Amended) Component according to claim 2, wherein the irreversible modifications of the structure of the individual volumes of the transparent material are

RECEIVED
JUN - 14 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

obtained by the focusing of the electromagnetic radiation.

9. (Amended) Component according to claim 1, further comprising a [the] converging lens and a reflector of a headlamp, the reflector of which having [has] an elliptical section.

AUTHORIZATIONS

The Amendment is being timely filed. No fee is believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4767. Likewise, any overpayment is credited to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4767.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: June 3, 2003

By: John M. Pratt Reg. #46,339
fr Mark D. Pratt
Reg. No.:45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154